UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/899,829	07/05/2001	Paul Stahura	323328003US	1306

25096 7590 10/07/2004

PERKINS COIE LLP
PATENT-SEA
P.O. BOX 1247
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER	
DOAN, DUYEN MY	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/899,829	STAHURA, PAUL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Duyen M Doan	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 July 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-72* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detail Action

Oath/Declaration

It does not identify the citizenship of each inventor.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Figure 7, telephone 711 is mention in the specification, but not in the drawing. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Figure 9 mentioned in the specification where step 904 determine if the telephone call is answered, then the component conducts a telephone call in block 907 not 906.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 is rejected because the phrase "certain amount of time" was held to be indefinite because the specification lacked some standard for measuring the degree intended and therefore properly rejected as indefinite under 112 second paragraph. Ex parte Oetiker, 23 USPQ2d 641 (Bd. PA&I. 1992).

Claim 50 recites the limitation "the resource is a web page" in claim 45. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The applicant claims a data structure having domain main name, but the first level and another level of the domain name are not data structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

1. Claims 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Voit (6104711).

As per claim 12, Voit discloses a method in a computer system for mapping domain names to addresses, the method comprising: providing a domain name mapping of domain names to intermediate identifiers (col10, line 9-11).

providing an address mapping of intermediate identifiers to addresses (col10, line 1-2);

receiving a domain name (col9, line 56-59).

identifying from the domain name mapping an intermediate identifier associated with the received domain name (col10, line 18-20).

identifying from the address mapping an address associated with the identified intermediate identifier; and sending the identified address as the address of the received domain name (col6, line 1-5).

As per claim 13, Voit discloses wherein the intermediate identifier is a telephone number (col10, line 18-20).

As per claim 15, Voit discloses the telephone number is part of the domain name (col11, line 58-62).

As per claim 16, Voit discloses a second-level domain name is a telephone number (col8, line 52-57).

As per claim 17, Voit discloses a third-level domain name is a telephone number (col8, line 52-57).

As per claim 18, Voit discloses the telephone number is a parameter of a uniform resource identifier that includes the domain name (col8, line52-57).

As per claim 19, Voit discloses the intermediate identifier is a dynamic address name (col9, line 4-8).

As per claim 20, Voit discloses the dynamic address name is a name of a user of an instant messaging system (col6, line 43-48).

As per claim 21, Voit discloses the address mapping is providing by a dynamic address system (col9, line 64-69).

As per claim 22, Voit discloses the dynamic address system is an instant messaging system (col6, line 43-48).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 23, 24, 25, 26, 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ryan (6412014).

As per claim 1, Ryan discloses a method in a computer system for providing dynamic addresses for devices, the method comprising:

receiving a domain name associated with a device;(figure 1, server 3 and communication line 5).

identifying a dynamic address name associated with the received domain name; (col 4, line 37-41).

sending to a dynamic address system the identified dynamic address name, the dynamic address system having a mapping from dynamic address names to addresses wherein devices have a dynamic address name and register their address with the dynamic address system; (col 5, line 7-11).

receiving from the dynamic address system an address for the identified dynamic address name; (col 5, line 20-23).

and sending the received address as the address for the device associated with the domain name (col 5, line 25-30).

As per claim 3, Ryan discloses the device is connected to the Internet (col4, line 64-65).

As per claim 4, Ryan discloses the device is a web server (col4, line 65-67).

As per claim 5, Ryan discloses the address is an IP address (col5, line 17-19).

As per claim 6, Ryan discloses the computer system is a domain name server (col5, line 7-10).

As per claim 7, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a top-level domain name server (col3, line 52-56).

As per claim 8, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a second level domain name server (col6, line 24-26).

As per claim 23, Ryan discloses a method in a computer system for providing dynamic addresses for devices, the method comprising: providing a mapping from dynamic address names to addresses (col5, line 7-11)

receiving from a domain name server a dynamic address name associated with a device (figure1, communication line 9).

identifying from the provided mapping an address to which the received dynamic address name maps (figure 1, directory page 7).

and sending to the domain name server the identified address so that the domain name server can provide the identified address as an address associated with the device (figure 1, communication line 11).

As per claim 24, Ryan discloses the domain name server maps domain names to dynamic address names (col4, line 37-41).

As per claim 25, Ryan discloses wherein the device is connected to the Internet (col4, line 64-65).

As per claim 26, Ryan discloses the device is a web server (col4, line 65-67).

As per claim 29, Ryan discloses the address is an IP address (col5, line 17-19).

As per claim 30, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a top-level domain name server (col3, line 52-56).

As per claim 31, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a second level domain name server (col6, line 24-26).

Claim 32 is rejected for the same reason as claim 1, because the URI is the same as the domain name.

As per claim 33, Ryan discloses the resource is a device connected to the Internet (col4, line 64-65).

As per claim 34, Ryan discloses the computer system is a website (fig1, web page 17).

As per claim 35, Ryan discloses the uniform resource identifier is received after a domain name server directs a resolution request for an address to the computer system (col5, line 20-30).

As per claim 36, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a second level domain name server (col6, line 24-26).

As per claim 37, Ryan discloses the domain name server is a top-level domain name server (col3, line 52-56).

As per claim 38, Ryan discloses the address is an IP address (col5, line 17-19).

3. Claim 40 – 50, 53-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gibson (2002/0016174).

As per claim 40, Gibson discloses a method in a computer system for placing a telephone call over a network, the method comprising: receiving a domain name from a client computer, the domain name being associated with a telephone number (page 3, paragraph 24).

identifying an address of a telephone server associated with the telephone number associated with the domain name (page 7, paragraph 63).

and sending the identified address to the client computer wherein, when the client computer accesses the identified address, a telephone call is placed to the telephone number associated with the domain name (page 7, paragraph 63).

As per claim 41, Gibson discloses the telephone number is part of the domain name (page 2-3, paragraph 23).

As per claim 42, Gibson disclosed the telephone number is a second level domain name (page 3, paragraph 27).

As per claim 43, Gibson discloses the telephone number is a third level domain name (page 2-3, paragraph 23).

As per claim 44, Gibson discloses the telephone number dispersed throughout the domain name (page2-3, paragraph 23).

As per claim 45, Gibson discloses the domain name identifies a name that is associated with at telephone number (page 4, paragraph 32).

As per claim 46, Gibson discloses the name is a name of a person (page 4, paragraph 32).

As per claim 47, Gibson discloses the name is a name of an organization (page 4, paragraph 32).

As per claim 48, Gibson discloses the name is a name of a business entity (page 4, paragraph 32).

As per claim 49, Gibson discloses the name is alphabetic (page 4, paragraph 32), numeric (page 5, paragraph 42), or alphanumeric (page 4, paragraph 34).

As per claim 50, Gibson discloses the resource is a web page (page 3, paragraph 27).

As per claim 53, the applicant claims a computer readable medium containing a data structure having a domain name comprising: a top-level domain name; and another level domain name that identifies a telephone number to be called when the domain name is specified.

A top-level domain name and another level domain name are not the data structure.

Claims 54-57 are rejected for the same reason as claim 53.

4. Claim 40, 51, 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hakim (6614780).

As per claim 40, Hakim discloses a method in a computer system for placing a telephone call over a network, the method comprising: receiving a domain name from a client computer, the domain name being associated with a telephone number (col1, line 50-52).

identifying an address of a telephone server associated with the telephone number associated with the domain name (col1, line 52-55).

and sending the identified address to the client computer wherein, when the client computer accesses the identified address, a telephone call is

placed to the telephone number associated with the domain name (col1, line 55-59).

As per claim 51, Hakim discloses the telephone call is associated with a voice conversation (col4, line 6-12).

As per claim 52, Hakim discloses the telephone is associated with a facsimile transmission (col4, line 6-12).

5. Claim 58-60, 64-66, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strentzsch (6256671).

As per claim 58, Strentzsch discloses a method in a computer system for mapping a domain name with no associated address to an address, the method comprising: receiving a domain name from a client (col6, line 10-11); determining whether an address is associated with the received domain name (col6, line 11-13); and when it is determined that an address is not associated with the received domain name, sending a search request based on the domain name to a search engine (col6, line 19-22); receiving from the search engine an address associated with the search results (col6, line 22-26); and sending to the client the received address so that the client can access the search results (col6, line26-30).

As per claim 59, Strentzsch discloses the address is an IP address (col6, line 11-18).

As per claim 60, Strentzsch discloses the computer system is a domain name server (col6, line 11-26).

As per claim 64, Strentzsch discloses a method in a computer system for mapping a domain name with no associated address to an address, the method comprising: receiving a domain name from a client computer (col6, line 10-11); determining whether an address is associated with the received domain name (col6, line 11-13); and when it is determined that an address is not associated with the received domain name, redirecting the client computer to a search engine that provides search results to the client computer based on the domain name (col6, line 37-43).

As per claim 65, Strentzsch discloses the address is an IP address (col6, line 11-18).

As per claim 66, Strentzsch discloses the computer system is a domain name server (col6, line 11-26).

As per claim 70, Strentzsch discloses a method in a computer system for mapping a domain name with no associated address to an address, the method comprising: sending to a domain name server a domain name (col6, line 39-40); receiving from the domain name server an indication that the sent domain name is not mapped to an address; and upon receiving the indication, automatically sending to a search engine a search request based on the sent domain name; and displaying search results provided by the search engine (col6, line 50-55).

6. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sitaraman (6243749).

As per claim 63, Sitaraman discloses a method in a computer system for mapping a domain name with no associated address to an address, the method comprising: receiving a domain name from a client (col2, line 31-35); determining whether an address is associated with the received domain name (col2, line 36-40); and when it is determined that an address is not associated with the received domain name, sending to the client an address of an alternate server computer so that the client can access the alternate server computer (col2, line 40-58).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (6412014) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Anderson (5974453) and Huitema (6016512).

Ryan teaches all the limitations of claim 1 mentioned above, but he does not teach the sending of the received address includes sending an indication not to catch the received address.

Anderson teaches the sending of the received address includes sending an indication not to catch the received address (col3, line 63-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan, Anderson and Huitema before him at he time of the invention, to include an indication not to catch the received address because due to the dramatic increase in the size of the Internet since the late 1980's the caching technique no longer provides high quality results. Typically, fewer than 85 percent if queries are served in less than three seconds. This is expected to worsen as the Internet grows (Huitema, col2, line 13-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use combine the three references.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (6412014) and Kapoor (6205486).

Ryan teaches every limitation of claim 1 mentioned above, but he does not teach the sending of the received address including sending an indicator to cache the received address for a certain amount of time.

Kapoor teaches the sending of the received address including sending an indicator to cache the received address for a certain amount of time (col2, line 15-19).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Kapoor before him at he time of the invention, to include an indication to catch the received address for a certain amount of time because a shorter cache time, sometimes referred to as time to live (TTL), lead to increased DNS traffic and slower response times (Kapoor,

col2, line 22-24). Longer TTL time may result in a "skewed locking" problem (Kapoor, col2, line 26-30).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to cache the received address for a certain amount of time to utilize network traffic.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (6412014) and Liu.

Ryan teaches every limitation of claim 1 mentioned above, but he does not teach the sending to the dynamic address system authentication information along with the identified dynamic address name so that the dynamic address system can authenticate the computer system.

Liu teaches sending to the dynamic address system authentication information along with the identified dynamic address name so that the dynamic address system can authenticate the computer system (col1, line 49-61). Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Liu before him at he time of the invention, to include the sending to the dynamic address system authentication information along with the identified dynamic address name so that the dynamic address system can authenticate the computer system to limit individual's abilities to access various host system.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voit and Chua.

Voit teaches every limitation of claim 12 and 13 above, but he does not teach the address mapping maps telephone numbers to addresses of servers where a call to the telephone number is a local call.

Chua teaches the address mapping maps telephone numbers to addresses of servers where a call to the telephone number is a local call (col1, line 17-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Voit and Chua before him at he time of the invention, to include the address mapping maps telephone numbers to addresses of servers where a call to the telephone number is a local call. The reduce cost of using the Internet for voice telephony services is evident in the growing popularity of this service, especially for long-distance calls (Hua, col1, line 20-24).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references for the address mapping maps telephone numbers to addresses of servers where a call to the telephone number is a local call so the cost of making a long distance call would significantly reduce.

11. Claims 61, 62, 67, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strentzsch (6256671) and Sitaraman (6243749).

As respect to claim 61, Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claims 58, 60 above, but he does not particularly mention the domain name server is a top-level domain name server.

Sitaraman teaches the domain name server is a top-level domain name server (col2, line 41-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Sitaraman before him at he time of the invention, to include the domain name server is a top-level domain name, because the top level domain name is broadest level or the top hierarchy of the domain name system. The user must recursively navigate down the branches of DNS servers in the com domain until locating the address it needs (Sitarama, col2, line 53-55, line 59-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to include the top level domain name because the domain name system always start at the top level domain name when mapping a domain name to the IP address.

As respect to claim 62, Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claims 58, 60 above, but he does not particularly mention the domain name server is a second-level domain name server.

Sitaraman teaches the domain name server is a second-level domain name server (col2, line 41-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Sitaraman before him at he time of the invention, to include the domain name server is a second-level domain name because the user must recursively navigate down the branches of DNS servers

in the com domain until locating the address it needs (Sitarama, col2, line 53-55, line 59-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to include the second level domain name because the domain name system always start at the top level domain name when mapping a domain name to the IP address, but if it could not find the matching IP address it has to go down one or more level of the domain name system until it can find the matching IP address.

As respect to claim 67, Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claim 64, 66 mentioned above, but he does not teach the domain name server is a top-level domain name server

Sitaraman teaches the domain name server is a top-level domain name server (col2, line 41-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Sitaraman before him at he time of the invention, to include the domain name server is a top-level domain name, because the top level domain name is broadest level or the top hierarchy of the domain name system. The user must recursively navigate down the branches of DNS servers in the com domain until locating the address it needs (Sitarama, col2, line 53-55, line 59-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to include the top level domain name because the

domain name system always start at the top level domain name when mapping a domain name to the IP address.

As respect to claim 68, Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claim 64, 66 mentioned above, but he does not teach the domain name server is a second-level domain name server.

Sitaraman teaches the domain name server is a second-level domain name server (col2, line 41-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Sitaraman before him at he time of the invention, to include the domain name server is a second-level domain name because the user must recursively navigate down the branches of DNS servers in the com domain until locating the address it needs (Sitarama, col2, line 53-55, line 59-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to include the second level domain name because the domain name system always start at the top level domain name when mapping a domain name to the IP address, but if it could not find the matching IP address, it has to go down one or more level of the domain name system until it can find the matching IP address.

12. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strentzsch (6256672) and Huitema (6016512).

Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claim 64 mentioned above, but he does not teach an address is not associated with the received domain name because it is not a registered domain name.

Huitema teaches an address is not associated with the received domain name because it is not a registered domain name (col1, line 63-67, figure 2).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Huitema before him at he time of the invention, to include an address is not associated with the received domain name because it is not a registered domain name. When the domain name system tries to search for a matching IP address to the domain name, it is obvious that sometime the domain name is not even exists, the user may of mistype or guesses the domain name.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to include an address is not associated with the received domain name because it is not a registered domain name.

13. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strentzsch (6256672) and Gibson (2002/0016174).

Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claim 70 mentioned above, but he does not teach a browser performs the automatic sending.

Gibson teaches a browser performs the sending (page 4, paragraph 38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch and Gibson before him at he time of the invention to have a browser performs the automatic sending because when a

person want to access to a website he or she need only type in the domain name and the browser would pre-pend http://www and the browser launches a web search (Gibson, page4, paragraph 38).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill art to combine the two references to have a browser to do the automatic sending so the client will be able to view the desire website and only need to type in the domain name.

14. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Strentzsch as applied to claim 70 above, and further in view of Gibson and Fryer.

Strentzsch teaches all the limitations of claim 70 mentioned above, but he does not teach a plug-in of a browser performs the automatic sending.

Gibson teaches a browser performs the sending (page 4, paragraph 38). But Gibson does not teach a plug-in of a browser performs the automatic sending.

Fryer, editor of Microsoft Computer Dictionary disclose that some web browser require helper applications or plug-in to accomplish the display of graphics that are in the document, play audio and video files (Microsoft computer dictionary, page 505, definition of web browser).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Strentzsch, Gibson and the dictionary before him at he time of the invention to have a plug in of a browser performs the automatic sending because the user will able to view graphic, audio or video file that associated with the web page.

15. Claims 2, 27, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (6412014) and Parker (6677976).

As respect to claim 2, Ryan teaches all the limitations of claim 1 above, but he does not teach the dynamic address system supports instant messaging and the dynamic address name identifies a user of the instant messaging system, the user being a device associated with the address.

Parker teaches instant messaging and the dynamic address name identifies a user of the instant messaging system, the user being a device associated with the address (col1, line 38-67, col2 line 17-39, col8, line 7-15).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Parker before him at he time of the invention to have the dynamic address system supports instant messaging and the dynamic address name identifies a user of the instant messaging system, the user being a device associated with the address. Because the instant messaging system does allow real time interaction and enable to initiate a private exchange of message.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references have the dynamic address system to support instant messaging.

As respect to claim 27, Ryan teaches all the limitations of claim 23 above, but he does not teach the computer system is an instant messaging system.

Parker teaches the computer system is an instant messaging (col2, line 32-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Parker before him at he time of the invention to have the computer system as an instant messaging. Because the instant messaging system does allow real time interaction and enable to initiate a private exchange of message.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references have the computer system as an instant messaging.

As respect to claim 39, Ryan teaches all the limitations of claim 32 above, but he does not teach the dynamic address system is an instant messaging system and the dynamic address name identifies a web site that registered its address with the instant messaging system.

Parker teaches an instant messaging and the dynamic address name identifies a user of the instant messaging system and the dynamic address name identifies a web site that registered its address with the instant messaging system (col1, line 38-67, col2 line 17-39, col8).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Parker before him at he time of the invention to have an instant messaging and the dynamic address name identifies a user of the instant messaging system and the dynamic address name identifies

a web site that registered its address with the instant messaging system. Because the instant messaging system does allow real time interaction and enable to initiate a private exchange of message.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references have the dynamic address system to support instant messaging.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ryan (6412014) and Sitaraman (6243749).

Ryan teaches all the limitations of claim 23 above, but he does not teach receiving a new address for a dynamic address name and update the mapping to map the dynamic address name to the new address.

Sitaraman teaches the updating of the old IP address with the new IP address (col5, line 11-21).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one, having ordinary skill in the art having the teachings of Ryan and Sitaraman before him at he time of the invention to include the receiving a new address for a dynamic address name and update the mapping to map the dynamic address name to the new address. Because by replacing the old IP address with the new IP address every time a user log into the system, it would limit the number of IP address while still providing access to the greatest number of users (Sitaraman, col3, line 1-20).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine these two references to replace the old IP address with the new IP address (dynamic IP address).

References Ronen, Zhang, Millard, Waite cited as pertinent but not relied on.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M Doan whose telephone number is (703) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 703 308 5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

dd

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100